



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/559,965 11/17/95 SPEAR

D EH-9376

EXAMINER
SGANTZOS, M

34M2/0701

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

6

KENNETH C BARAN
PRATT & WHITNEY
PATENT DEPARTMENT-MS 132-13
400 MAIN STREET
EAST HARTFORD CT 06108

3401

DATE MAILED: 07/01/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☒ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1-3 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 1-3 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 3401

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
2. The drawings are objected to because they do not include certain reference signs mentioned in the description. 37 CFR § 1.84(f) states, "Reference signs not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawing and vice versa." The following reference signs are not included in the drawings: **σ2** . Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1 and 2, The phrase "under **some** operational condition" is indefinite since it is not understood under what condition is the end shock formed. Claim 3 is indefinite since the phrase " the inner transition radius" lacks proper antecedent basis (with regards to claim 1 only).

Art Unit: 3401

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1 and 2 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

5. Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hausmann 2934259, Roy 2935246, Erwin 3692425, Kurzrock et al 4408957 and Russian 1528965 show various blades subject to shock phenomena.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Sgantzios whose telephone number is (703) 308-2624.


EDWARD K. LOOK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 3400

6/21/96


M.S.
June 20, 1996